

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,711,147 B1 (Barnes) in view of the Gustafsson reference from Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement (hereinafter Gustafsson). Claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes in view of Gustafsson and U.S. Patent No. 6,735,187 B1 (Helander).

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, of independent Claim 1, the Examiner states that the specification lacks support for a GGSN transmitting an Agent Advertisement message containing the address of another GGSN. After reviewing the specification of the present application, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. For example, the paragraph beginning at Line 24 of Page 12 of the specification teaches that the gateway foreign address of the GGSN 60 included in the received Agent Advertisement message is identical to the address of the GGSN serving as the gateway foreign agent. In other words, the GFA address of the GGSN 65 is received with the Agent Advertisement message transmitted by GGSN 60, thus, providing support for the subject limitations. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, of Claim 4, the Examiner states that the correspondent node recited in Claim 4 lacks antecedent basis. Upon reviewing the Claims of the present application, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect because a correspondent node is found in the preamble of Claim 1. Therefore proper antecedent basis can be found for the recitation of the correspondent node, as recited in Claim 4. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph of Claim 4 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that Barnes teaches each and every limitation of Claim 1, except for upon receiving an Agent Advertisement message with an address of the second GGSN and information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function, said Agent Advertisement message being transmitted by the first GGSN, and transmitting by the second GGSN a location information message to the home agent. However, the Examiner cites Gustafsson in an effort to cure this deficiency. After reviewing the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

First, the Examiner states Barnes teaches registering by the second GGSN an address of the first GGSN to which the mobile node belongs (in Column 14, Lines 19-23), and the first GGSN transmitting to the home agent, during a re-registration, a Location information message indicating the address of the first GGSN to which the mobile node belongs (Column 14, Lines 20-23 and 33-37). Regarding Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. Claim 1 recites “registering by the

second GGSN an address of the first GGSN to which the mobile node belongs, and then transmitting to the home agent, during a re-registration, a Location Information message indicating the address of the first GSN to which the mobile node belongs.” In other words, the second GGSN registers the address and then transmits a Location Information message. However, in his rejection, the Examiner has mischaracterized the limitations of Claim 1 and states the first GGSN transmitting to the home agent, during a re-registration, a Location information message indicating the address of the first GGSN to which the mobile node belongs. However, as stated above, this is a mischaracterization of the subject limitation.

Moreover, the Examiner equates the first GGSN and the second GGSN, as recited in Claim 1, with the new GSN/FA and the old GSN/FA, as recited in Barnes, and equates the home agent, as recited in Claim 1, with the HA, as taught by Barnes. However, with reference to FIG. 7 of Barnes and the cited passages and text, upon which the Examiner relies to support rejection of the subject limitations, it is seen that the HA (254) receives only a single message, which is transmitted from the new GSN/FA (284), as opposed the old GSN/FA (258). Accordingly, as it is the new GSN/FA (284) which transmits the message, the cited passage of Barnes does not teach or suggest registering by the second GGSN an address of the first GGSN to which the mobile node belongs, and then transmitting to the home agent, during a re-registration, a Location Information message indicating the address of the first GSN to which the mobile node belongs, as recited in Claim 1. The Examiner acknowledges that Barnes does not teach or suggest transmitting

by the second GGSN a location information message to the home agent (e.g., see, Office Action, bottom page 4) and cites section 3.4.2 of Gustafsson to cure this deficiency. However, Claim 1 includes the recitation “during a re-registration,” as opposed to an initial registration which is performed when a mobile node first arrives at a visited domain. However, the cited passage and text of Gustafsson describes a home registration (e.g., see, Gustafsson, section 3.4 title “Home Registration”) performed “[w]hen a mobile node first arrives at a visited domain,” i.e., an initial registration (as opposed to a regional registration, which Gustafsson discloses in section 3.5 and illustrates in FIG. 3 in which the HA is not seen to receive any message from the FA2 of GFA).

Furthermore, regarding the Examiner’s assertion that Barnes (in Column 14, Lines 33-36) teaches transmitting the location registration request from the first GSN to the second GGSN, the cited passage and text of Barnes states “At step 514, the new GSN/FA 284 sends a modified mobile IP+ Registration Request message to the GSN/HA 254 to update its registration location information. At step 516, the GSN/HA 254 sends a MAP + Registration Reply message back to the GSN/FA 284.” In other words, the new GSN/FA (which the Examiner equates with the first GGSN, as recited in Claim 1) merely sends and receives messages to/from the GSN/HA (which the Examiner equates with the home agent, as recited in Claim 1). This is more clearly seen with reference to steps 514 and 516 of FIG. 7 of Barnes. However, the cited passage and text of Barnes does not teach or suggest transmitting the location registration request from the first GSN to the second GGSN, as recited in Claim 1.

Additionally, Claim 1 includes the recitation transmitting a location registration request from the mobile node to the first GGSN, upon receiving an Agent Advertisement message with an address of the second GGSN and information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function, said Agent Advertisement message being transmitted by the first GGSN. In other words, the transmission is dependent upon a predetermined condition i.e., upon receiving an Agent Advertisement message with an address of the second GGSN and information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function. In his rejection, the Examiner states that Barnes does not teach or suggest this condition i.e., upon receiving an Agent Advertisement message with an address of the second GGSN and information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function, and cites Gustafsson in an effort to cure this deficiency. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. Gustafsson does not teach or suggest upon receiving an Agent Advertisement message with information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function. The present application, as defined by the Claims, is drawn to a method in which a GGSN can perform an optional FA function (e.g., see, paragraphs beginning at line 3, page 11 and line 25, page 16 of the present application). In the rejection, the Examiner equates the GGSNs, as recited by the Claims of the present application, with the FAs of GFAs, as taught by Gustafsson. However, Gustafsson merely teaches using FAs or GFAs, as opposed to GGSNs having an added optional FA function, as disclosed by the Claims. Rather, since Gustafsson merely teaches using FAs and GFAs, as such, there would be no reason to check if a GGSN

supports an optional FA function, nor to check Agent Advertisement message with information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function. Moreover, the Examiner acknowledges Gustafsson does not teach or suggest FAs and the GFAs are GGSNs, as recited in the Claims of the present application (e.g., see, Office Action dated January 4, 2005). Accordingly, as all FAs as taught by Gustafsson support an FA function there would be no reason for Gustafsson to teach or suggest the added limitation of information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, as neither Barnes nor Gustafsson, either alone or in combination thereof, teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 1, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of independent Claim 7, Claim 7 includes similar recitations as those contained in Claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 7 is patentably distinct for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent Claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of independent Claim 7 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1 and 7 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-6 and 8-10, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the

rejections of dependent Claims 2-6 and 8-10 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-10, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", is written over the typed name.

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG:ml